Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-553 Appl. No. 09/917,147 Amdt. Dated: December 14, 2005 Response to Office Action of 08/22/2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 3 to 8 are pending. No claims are allowed.

Independent Claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended to clearly recite the significant wide angle x-ray lines which characterizes Applicants' boehmite composition as shown in Figures 2, 5 and 7B and as set forth in the Examples. This includes particularly the intense wide angle line at about 11.5 which is characteristic of boehmite and which is absent from the references of record as shown by the Declarations Under 37 CFR 1.132 of record regarding certain of the references.

Claims 1 and 3 to 8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as anticipated, or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the two <u>Gonzales-Pena</u> references. The amended claims now clearly distinguish over these references based upon the Declarations Under 37 CFR 1.132 of record. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 3 to 8 were rejected as anticipated under 35 USC 102(a), or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over <u>Pinnavaia</u> et al (U.S. 6,027,706). This reference is also distinguished in the Declarations Under 37 CFR 1.132 of record. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 3 to 8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated, or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Bagshaw et al. This reference does not mention

Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-553 Appl. No. 09/917,147 Amdt. Dated: December 14, 2005 Response to Office Action of 08/22/2005

anything remotely resembling the claimed boehmite composition invention. The method disclosed uses the type of non-ionic surfactant as in U.S. Patent No. 6,027,706 to <u>Pinnavaia</u> et al. There is no reason to expect any different result. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 6 to 8 were rejected as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b), or as obvious over Figure 2 of this reference shows no wide Vaudry et al. diffraction angle lines. Thus this reference could not possibly suggest the claimed invention to one skilled in later publication the art. Enclosed is a acknowledges the fact that the products are anhydrous (see underlining added; Valange, Sabine, et al., "Optimization of synthesis parameters leading to mesoporous aluminas with crystalline pore walls; Abstract of Paper, May 1-4, 2004, 2 pages). Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 3 to 6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated, or obvious under 35 USC 103(a) over <u>Kolenda</u> et al (U.S. 6,197,276). This product is clearly amorphous as can be seen from the graphs of the low angle x-ray diffractions. The product contains alkaline cations (Na⁺, K⁺ NH₄⁺). Further the product is not calcined as in Claims 7 and 8 or calcineable as set forth in the remaining Claims 1 and 3 to 6.

Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-553 Appl. No. 09/917,147 Amdt. Dated: December 14, 2005 Response to Office Action of 08/22/2005

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

It is now believed that Claims 1 and 3 to 8 are in condition for allowance. Notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully,

Ian C. McLeod

Registration No. 20,931

McLeod & Moyne, P.C. 2190 Commons Parkway Okemos, Michigan 48864 (517) 347-4100 Fax: (517) 347-4103

Enclosure: Valange, Sabine, et al., "Optimization of synthesis parameters leading to mesoporous aluminas with crystalline pore walls; Abstract of Paper, May 1-4, 2004, 2 pages